Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	arv	10/056,212	MULLIGAN
	ui y	Examiner	Art Unit
		John S. Chu	1752
All Participants: Status of Application:			
(1) <u>John S. Chu</u> .		(3)	
(2) <u>Sean Mahoney</u> .		(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 April 2004 + 7 April 200	94	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:			
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: Rejection over Kurisaki and a potential rejection over Schupp et al			
Claims discussed: 34 and 37			
Prior art documents discussed: KURISAKI and SCHUPP et al			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet			
Part III.			•
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 			
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representativ	re Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/056,212

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner proposed an Examiner's amendment to claims 34 and 37 to include the acid generator and the colorant into claims 34 and 37 to overcome a rejection over Kurisaki. Schupp et al was cited as a new reference, however the reference fails to anticipate the claimed invention in light of the Examiner's amendment above.